

167864

David Burden

11/19/2001 01:12 PM

To: Mike Ribordy/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

cc:

Subject: Re: Sauget Areas 1 and 2 Superfund Sites. [E]

Mike,

What is your time frame for comments on the first two items (i.e Area 1)? If we could have until the end of the calendar year, no problem, considering holidays and folks needing to use annual leave. The second two items (i.e. Area 2) seem much further down the road. Let me know.

Dave

David S. Burden, Ph.D., Director
Ground-Water Technical Support Center
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
P.O. Box 1198
Ada, OK 74821-1198
Ph: 580-436-8606
Fx: 580-436-8614
Em: burden.david@epa.gov
Mike Ribordy

Mike Ribordy

11/19/01 10:35 AM

To: David Burden/ADA/USEPA/US@EPA

cc: DOUGLAS YESKIS/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject:

Dave:

Region 5 of the USEPA is requesting technical assistance of the Subsurface Protection and Remediation Division (SPRD Ada, OK), National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development to assess the presence and remediation options of DNAPL's at the Sauget Areas 1 and 2 Superfund Sites. The PRP's for Area 1 have completed a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) and is nearing the completion of a record of decision. The PRP's assessed the presence of DNAPL's and have been described in the document titled "Source Evaluation Study" that will be sent to you. We will also send to you some excerpts from the RI/FS report on the geology and ground water of the site. Preliminary discussions between Steve Acree of your staff and Doug Yeskis from Region 5 indicate that your laboratory may be able to provide technical assistance to our request. Our specific questions are:

1) The PRP's assessment in the Source Evaluation Study of remedial options included natural flushing and intensive pumping only. What are the other remedial options that should have been evaluated? We believe a modified pulse-pumping option should have been included, as well as, the use of steam-injection and surfactants. Are there more current remedial options that should also have been included? Are there technical limitations that should be considered at this site concerning other remedial options that require additional site characterization?

2) The PRP's, as far as we have been able to determine, have not evaluated the possibility of DNAPL movement on top of the fractured bedrock, within the weathered bedrock zone. Is this a potential migration pathway that needs further characterization? Are there other migration pathways of the DNAPL that we are missing in our evaluation?

Any work by your staff on this site should be charged to the site specific project account:

FY: 2002

Approp. Code: T

Budget Org/Code: 05F

Program Results: 50102D

Site Project: 054VC000

For the Sauget Area 2, the PRP's are just beginning the RI/FS. We will be sending you a copy of the work plan for work on that area. Our specific questions are:

- 1) Since the project is just beginning, we would like to ensure the proper data is collected from the onset of site characterization. Are there any additional characterization activities you would recommend for this RI/FS?
- 2) Would additional source characterization activities within the landfill be cost-effective, or would it be more cost-effective to assume the source term can not be remediated and therefore only concentrate site characterization activities on the contaminant and DNAPL migration from the landfill?

We will be sending a package with the referenced documents shortly. We would like to be contacted by the technical support person you assign once he/she has received the package to try and set up a site visit, if they feel it would be helpful. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 312-886-4592. Thanks

Mike